

local law enforcement officers as well as State and local attorneys. They cover almost 70 of Iowa's 99 counties. Officers pool resources and equipment to carry out drug investigations and the attorneys provide legal advice to ensure a sound drug investigation. In Waterloo, IA, the State and local task force even works with the U.S. attorneys office to form a Federal, State and local crime fighting team.

And Mr. President, like a one-two punch, the Byrne Program's special emphasis on drug abuse prevention gets to the heart of the problem and moves us toward a long-term solution to crime prevention. Violent crimes committed by youth have increased over 50 percent from 1988 to 1992 and drugs are a major factor in many violent crimes. DARE—drug abuse resistance education programs, put police officers in schools talking to kids about drug abuse. DARE programs serve 70,000 Iowa students. Traditional drug abuse programs dwell on the harmful effects of drugs. Iowa's DARE programs help students recognize and resist the many subtle pressures that influence them to experiment with alcohol and other drugs.

Violence in this country will be reduced because of officers on the front line making a difference in their community and getting the resources they need to do the job. The Byrne Grant Program is a critically important component in halting the increased incidences of crime and violence in our society.

I was pleased that our push for increased funding for the Byrne Grant Program paid off. The fiscal year 1996 Commerce, State, Justice bill passed by the Senate, provides a \$25 million increase over last year's funding. We need to build on the progress we have made in our fight against crime and continue to support successful and effective programs such as the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.●

LAWSUIT ABUSE AWARENESS WEEK

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I proudly acknowledge a group of citizens in West Virginia who are hard at work to address an issue affecting every citizen of our State: Lawsuit abuse.

In many areas of West Virginia, local citizens are getting involved with a group they call Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse, with the goal of making the public more aware of the costs and problems stemming from excessive numbers and kinds of lawsuits.

The CALA effort focuses on education. These citizens are speaking out about an issue that has statewide and national consequences. The costs of lawsuit abuse include higher costs for consumer products, higher medical expenses, higher taxes, and lost business expansion and product development.

The mission of Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse is to curb lawsuit abuse. Here is an example of West Virginians devoting energy and effort towards solving problems that cost our State jobs, profits, and opportunity.

My own work in this has focused on the problems of our product liability system, and I got involved when I saw the terrible consequences of the country's confusing, patchwork, slow, and often unfair system of product liability rules that badly need reform. The help of individuals, including members of the legal profession, involved in Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse in West Virginia, has been crucial to the legislative success we are finally with the product liability reform bill that I introduced once again early in this Congress. In May, working closely with Senator GORTON of Washington State, we succeeded in winning Senate approval of our bill and we are now hoping to engage in a conference with the House of Representatives to develop a final bill for the President's signature.

Legal reform of any kind is not a simple issue. The legal system must function to provide justice to every American. But that does not mean that the status quo is necessarily perfect. When lawsuits and the courts can be used in excess or result in imposing costs on other parties, from individuals to non-profit agencies to businesses, without reason, the system should be reviewed and reformed if possible.

Through CALA in West Virginia, nonprofit groups have raised local funds to run educational media announcements and are speaking to local organizations and citizens groups across the State to raise public awareness on the lawsuit abuse issue.

Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse groups have declared October 30 through November 3, 1995, as "Lawsuit Abuse Awareness Week" in West Virginia.

I want to commend these citizens for their dedication and commitment and to acknowledge this week as a time of public awareness on the serious issues associated with lawsuit abuse.●

A DEEPLY FLAWED IMMIGRATION BILL

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, now that the House Judiciary Committee has passed comprehensive immigration reform legislation, many eyes will be turning to the Senate to see what efforts in this area will take place here.

One fundamental question facing the Senate is whether to address illegal and legal immigration reform in the same legislation. Though the House has thus far chosen this path, I do not think the Senate should follow its example. At the very least, we in the Senate ought to limit the drastic and unwarranted cuts in legal immigration that appear in the legislation passed in the House Committee, and should approach the issue of backlogs in family

categories with the fairness on which we pride ourselves.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD an October 23, 1995, editorial in the Chicago Tribune entitled "A Deeply Flawed Immigration Bill." The editorial aptly notes that while Congress should take decisive and quick action to enforce our laws against illegal immigration—such as those endorsed on an unprecedented basis by the Clinton administration, it "can approve those without agreeing that legal immigrants are a problem in need of such harsh solutions." I agree with the Tribune's position, and urge my colleagues not to penalize those who have played by the rules for the conduct of those who have chosen not to play by the rules.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 23, 1995]

A DEEPLY FLAWED IMMIGRATION BILL

Since its creation, the United States has been a country of immigrants that welcomed new immigrants. But if Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee get their way, as they seem likely to do, the welcome will be quite a bit chillier for many foreigners who would like to come here legally and become part of America.

This is being done partly in the name of combating illegal immigration, which most Americans rightly think is warranted. But the bill being debated in the Judiciary Committee treats both legal and illegal immigrants as undesirable and out of control.

On illegal immigration, the measure sponsored by Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Tex) has much to recommend it. It authorizes the hiring of more Border Patrol agents and Labor Department inspectors to police the border and the workplace, raises penalties for the use of phony documents, provides money to build fences between the U.S. and Mexico, and streamlines deportation procedures for foreigners who arrive without proper documents.

It also attempts to crack down on employment of illegals by establishing a telephone registry to let employers verify that new hires are cleared to work. The registry, supposedly a pilot project, is probably too ambitious for a useful experiment, since it would affect all employers in five of the seven states getting the most foreigners—California, Texas, Illinois, Florida, New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts. But a smaller undertaking, as suggested by the Clinton administration, could yield valuable lessons.

The real problem lies in the proposed treatment of legal immigrants. First, the bill would drastically reduce the number allowed in, cutting the annual intake from 800,000 to fewer than 600,000. This approach presumes that people who come here legally are a burden, instead of the enriching source of renewal they always have been.

Second, among the categories of people who now get preference in the immigration queue are brothers and sisters, adult children and parents of citizens and legal permanent residents. The Smith bill would eliminate these explicitly or in effect, limiting "family reunification" to spouses and minor children of those already here.

This new priority does not seem misguided. But it can be legitimately criticized on grounds that it would leave in the lurch thousands of people who applied under the old rules and have waited to be admitted—some of them 10 or 15 years.